

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

|                          |   |                                |
|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| <b>HOSAM SMADI,</b>      | ) |                                |
|                          | ) |                                |
| <b>Petitioner,</b>       | ) |                                |
|                          | ) |                                |
| <b>vs.</b>               | ) | <b>Case No. 18-CV-1547-SMY</b> |
|                          | ) |                                |
| <b>WARDEN D. SPROUL,</b> | ) |                                |
|                          | ) |                                |
| <b>Respondent.</b>       | ) |                                |

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

**YANDLE, District Judge:**

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, Petitioner Hosam Smadi filed the instant habeas corpus action to challenge the loss of 15 days of good conduct time. On August 22, 2022, this Court denied Smadi’s habeas petition and entered judgment (Docs. 16 and 17). Smadi now moves for reconsideration (Doc. 18).

Under Rule 59(e), the Court may alter or amend its judgment if the movant “clearly establish[es] (1) that the court committed a manifest error of law or fact, or (2) that newly discovered evidence precluded entry of judgment.” *Blue v. Hartford Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 698 F.3d 587, 598 (7th Cir. 2012) (quoting *Harrington v. City of Chicago*, 433 F.3d 542, 546 (7th Cir. 2006)). Relief sought under Rule 59(e) is an “extraordinary remed[y] reserved for the exceptional case.” *Foster v. DeLuca*, 545 F.3d 582, 584 (7th Cir. 2008).

Motions for reconsideration are not appropriate vehicles for re-litigating arguments the Court previously rejected or for arguing issues or presenting evidence that could have been raised during the pendency of the motion presently under reconsideration. *Sigworth v. City of Aurora*, 487 F.3d 506, 512 (7th Cir. 2007). In other words, a proper motion to reconsider does more than

take umbrage and restate the arguments that were initially rejected. *County of McHenry v. Ins. Co. of the West*, 438 F.3d 813, 819 (7th Cir. 2006).

Here, Smadi raises unrelated incidents and accuses the BOP of being unprofessional, abusive, and mistreating him. He fails to identify any newly discovered case law, or a manifest error of law or fact committed by the Court. Accordingly, the Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. 18) is **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**DATED: September 15, 2022**



**STACI M. YANDLE**  
**United States District Judge**